



## Seasonal body size reductions with warming covary with major body size gradients in arthropod species

Horne, Curtis R.; Hirst, Andrew G.; Atkinson, David

*Published in:*  
Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences

*Link to article, DOI:*  
[10.1098/rspb.2017.0238](https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0238)

*Publication date:*  
2017

*Document Version*  
Peer reviewed version

[Link back to DTU Orbit](#)

*Citation (APA):*  
Horne, C. R., Hirst, A. G., & Atkinson, D. (2017). Seasonal body size reductions with warming covary with major body size gradients in arthropod species. *Proceedings of the Royal Society B: Biological Sciences*, 284(1851), [20170238]. <https://doi.org/10.1098/rspb.2017.0238>

---

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

## PROCEEDINGS B

**Seasonal Body Size Reductions with Warming Co-vary with  
Major Body Size Gradients in Arthropod Species**

Journal:	<i>Proceedings B</i>
Manuscript ID	RSPB-2017-0238.R1
Article Type:	Research
Date Submitted by the Author:	01-Mar-2017
Complete List of Authors:	Horne, Curtis; Queen Mary University of London, School of Biological and Chemical Sciences Hirst, Andrew; Queen Mary University of London, School of Biological and Chemical Sciences Queen Mary Atkinson, David; University of Liverpool, School of Biological Sciences
Subject:	Ecology < BIOLOGY
Keywords:	body size, plasticity, seasonal, warming, insects, Crustacea
Proceedings B category:	Ecology

SCHOLARONE™  
Manuscripts

1     **Seasonal Body Size Reductions with Warming Co-vary with Major**  
2     **Body Size Gradients in Arthropod Species**

3     **Curtis R. Horne<sup>a</sup>, Andrew. G. Hirst<sup>a,b\*</sup>, and David Atkinson<sup>c</sup>**

4

5     <sup>a</sup>School of Biological and Chemical Sciences, Queen Mary University of London, London, E1  
6     4NS, United Kingdom.

7     <sup>b</sup>Centre for Ocean Life, National Institute for Aquatic Resources, Technical University of  
8     Denmark, Kavalergården 6, 2920, Charlottenlund, Denmark

9     <sup>c</sup>Institute of Integrative Biology, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, L69 7ZB, United Kingdom.

10    \* *Corresponding author:* a.g.hirst@qmul.ac.uk

11

12    **Keywords:** Body size, plasticity, seasonal, warming, insects, Crustacea

13

14    **Author Contributions**

15    CH, AGH and DA designed the study and wrote the paper. CH collected the data and  
16    performed the statistical analyses.

17

18

19

20

## 21 **ABSTRACT**

22 Major biological and biogeographical rules link body size variation with latitude or  
23 environmental temperature, and these rules are often studied in isolation. Within multivoltine  
24 species, seasonal temperature variation can cause substantial changes in adult body size,  
25 as subsequent generations experience different developmental conditions. Yet, unlike other  
26 size patterns, these common seasonal temperature-size gradients have never been  
27 collectively analysed. We undertake the largest analysis to date of seasonal temperature-  
28 size gradients in multivoltine arthropods, including 102 aquatic and terrestrial species from  
29 71 global locations. Adult size declines in warmer seasons in 86% of the species examined.  
30 Aquatic species show a ~2.5-fold greater reduction in size per °C of warming than terrestrial  
31 species, supporting the hypothesis that greater oxygen limitation in water than in air forces  
32 aquatic species to exhibit greater plasticity in body size with temperature. Total percentage  
33 change in size over the annual cycle appears relatively constant with annual temperature  
34 range but varies between environments, such that the overall size reduction in aquatic-  
35 developing species (~31%) is almost 3-fold greater than in terrestrial species (~11%). For  
36 the first time, we show that strong correlations exist between seasonal temperature-size  
37 gradients, laboratory responses, and latitudinal-size clines, suggesting that these patterns  
38 share common drivers.

39

## 40 **INTRODUCTION**

41 Body size is a 'master trait', affecting vital rates (growth, survival, reproduction) and  
42 ecological processes ranging from individual performance (e.g. fitness) to ecosystem  
43 function (e.g. food web dynamics, productivity) [1-4]. Biologists have intensively studied body  
44 size variation for more than a century [5-8], including describing size clines over latitude and  
45 altitude in the field [9, 10]. Populations grown under controlled laboratory conditions show  
46 strong associations between mature body size and temperature [11-13], and food [14].

47 These emergent body size patterns have been formalised into prominent biogeographical  
48 and biological rules, including Bergmann's rule (inter-specific latitudinal clines: larger bodied  
49 species at higher, colder latitudes) [9], James' rule (intra-specific latitudinal clines: larger  
50 individuals at higher, colder latitudes) [15], and the temperature-size rule (TSR) (increased  
51 size at maturity when grown through ontogeny at decreased temperature) [11]. Furthermore,  
52 body size reduction has been described as the third universal response to climate warming  
53 [16].

54

55 The drivers of intraspecific body size clines across latitudes can differ from those of size  
56 responses to ontogenetic temperature treatments in the laboratory. The former can be  
57 influenced not just by phenotypic plasticity, but also by genetic variation among geographic  
58 populations [17], as well as many biotic and abiotic factors that could confound the effects of  
59 temperature, such as voltinism, season length, food supply, and natural enemies [18-22].  
60 Despite these confounding factors, temperature-size (T-S) responses measured under  
61 controlled laboratory conditions and latitudinal-size (L-S) clines measured in the field  
62 significantly co-vary across taxonomic orders within the Arthropoda. Specifically, taxonomic  
63 orders whose species demonstrate particularly strong negative T-S responses (i.e. following  
64 the TSR) also show strong intra-specific declines in adult size at lower latitudes (i.e.  
65 following James' rule), whereas those with less negative T-S responses tend to show  
66 reduced or reversed latitudinal-size clines [13]. This co-variation suggests that similar forces  
67 may be driving these important patterns.

68

69 It has been debated whether size responses are adaptive, or a maladaptive outcome of  
70 environmental stress or genetic drift [23], or simply a consequence of how constraints  
71 imposed by the architecture of the maturation mechanism may affect phenotypic outcomes  
72 of selection on body size, growth and development rate [24]. However, given the important

73 influence of body size on vital rates and ecological processes, systematic size responses to  
74 temperature are often considered adaptive [25, 26]. For example, variation in the direction of  
75 T-S responses and latitudinal-size clines has been attributed to differences in voltinism in  
76 terrestrial arthropods, likely an evolutionary adaptation to changing season length [13, 19,  
77 27]. Striking differences in the T-S response also occur between environments; aquatic-  
78 developing species show greater reductions in adult size per °C of warming, and stronger  
79 reductions in size with decreasing latitude towards the equator, than do air-breathing species  
80 [12, 13]. Oxygen availability, which includes both its concentration and diffusivity, is  
81 approximately  $3 \times 10^5$  times lower in water than in air [28], and body size reduction with  
82 warming is thought to be an important mechanism by which aquatic species maintain  
83 aerobic scope when faced with increased metabolic rate at elevated temperatures [12, 13,  
84 29]. Indeed, hypoxic conditions also commonly lead to reductions in size within species, both  
85 under natural conditions [30] and in laboratory manipulations, especially at warmer  
86 temperatures and/or larger body sizes [31].

87

88 Multivoltine ectotherms, which have more than one generation per year, can experience  
89 considerable differences in temperature, resources and suitable habitat between seasons,  
90 hence between generations. The effects of seasonal changes in temperature on optimum  
91 body sizes may therefore be easily confounded by other seasonally varying effects such as  
92 food, water, oxygen availability and mortality risks [18]. Nonetheless, seasonal body size  
93 variation commonly correlates strongly with changes in environmental temperature in a wide  
94 range of uni- and multicellular organisms, including bacteria [e.g. 32], rotifers [e.g. 33],  
95 copepods [e.g. 34, 35], cladocerans [e.g. 36] and insects [e.g. 37], examples of which are  
96 presented in Figure S1. Yet, despite the huge implications of environmental seasonality for  
97 global ecology, no broad exploration of seasonal size gradients has been performed to date.  
98 Such intra-annual shifts in size have important physiological, ecological and fitness  
99 consequences [18], and the magnitude and variation of such seasonal change across

diverse taxa, and between environments, needs to be investigated (cf. with latitudinal and altitudinal descriptions [38, 39]). Moreover, the question of whether the differences in body size gradients observed between environments and taxonomic orders, both in the laboratory and across latitudes, are also observed across seasons still remains unanswered. Improved understanding of size gradients across season will not only help to determine the ultimate causes of body size variation, but will also aid ecologists, including macro-ecologists, in understanding and predicting individual and community level responses to climate change [40]. This is critical given the link between decadal-scale changes in the body sizes of ectotherms and shifts in climate [41-43].

Our analysis focuses on the Arthropoda, which is the most taxonomically diverse and numerous phylum on earth [44], and which has huge ecological and economic importance [45, 46]. This well-studied group also shares a common ancestry and a related body plan. Here we present, to our knowledge, the largest synthesis of seasonal T-S gradients in multivoltine arthropods to date, including those of marine, freshwater and terrestrial species. Following from the stronger observed laboratory T-S responses and L-S clines in aquatic-developing than terrestrial species [12, 13], we predict that across seasons, species developing in water will also demonstrate a greater reduction in size per °C of warming than will species developing in air. We also assess the extent to which the seasonal T-S gradient depends on mean annual temperature, latitude and species body mass. Finally, we quantitatively compare seasonal T-S gradients with both T-S responses measured under controlled laboratory conditions and with L-S clines, to establish whether differences observed between environments and among taxa are consistent in these three major size gradients.

## METHODS

We searched the literature extensively using both the Web of Science database (<http://apps.webofknowledge.com/>) and Google Scholar for studies in which the adult body size of multivoltine arthropod species ( $\geq 2$  generations per year) was assessed in nature on multiple occasions during an annual cycle. We used records for which we could model a change in body size that occurred over at least a 3 month period. This criterion for data inclusion increased the likelihood of capturing variation in body size in different cohorts or generations. The primary search term combinations used were: (“seasonal” OR “temporal”) AND “body size” AND (“arthropod” OR “[<insert taxonomic order>]” AND “temperature”. We also identified related studies from reference lists in the papers we found, and sought further direction to key literature from relevant experts. Adult size data were collected as lengths, or dry, wet or carbon masses and subsequently standardised to dry mass (mg) using published intra-specific regressions and conversion factors (see Dataset S1 in Supplementary Information). If regressions for the species were not available, regressions for closely related species, or more general inter-specific regressions were used (in ~26% of cases). Taxonomic order and family were confirmed for each species using the World Registry of Marine Species [47] or the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) Taxonomy Database for freshwater and terrestrial species. In the case of planktonic species, to reduce potential sampling bias in the sizes of animals collected, only those studies in which the adults were sampled across the entire depth of the water column, or across most of the depth range of the species, were included. Maximum water sampling depth across all aquatic studies in our data set was 125m.

For each study included in our data set, we derived species-specific slopes of ordinary least-squares (OLS) regressions between  $\ln$ -transformed dry mass (mg) and environmental temperature at time of collection, using individuals of species as data points. We derived slopes for males and females separately wherever possible. This exponential function is overwhelmingly favoured for modelling seasonal T-S gradients, rather than linear, quadratic



and allometric relationships, giving an Akaike weight of 1 (see Table S1 in Supplementary Information). The exponential function is also the best for fitting body size-temperature relationships under controlled laboratory conditions and for latitudinal-size clines, again judged using Akaike weights [13, 48]. This common use of an exponential function allows us to easily compare all three of these size gradients. These 'seasonal T-S slopes' were also transformed into percentage change in dry mass per degree Celsius (hereby referred to as 'seasonal T-S gradients'), using the formula  $(\exp^{(\text{slope})} - 1) * 100 = \% \text{ change in mass per } ^\circ\text{C}$  [12]. A negative gradient shows a reduction in body size with increasing temperature, and hence follows the same trend as the temperature-size rule [11].

Where temperatures in a study were not reported for the entire year (n=19 of 79), we used high resolution global climate data to estimate mean annual temperature and annual temperature range (ATR) at each sampling location (from NOAA/OAR/ESRL PSD, Boulder, Colorado, USA), available online at <http://www.esrl.noaa.gov/psd/>. Specifically, we used weekly mean sea surface temperatures (SST) from 1989/12/31 to 2015/10/25 [year/month/day] (NOAA Optimum Interpolation Sea Surface Temperature dataset; 1.0 degree latitude x 1.0 degree longitude global grid) and long term monthly mean air temperature data from 1981 to 2010 (University of Delaware Air Temperature and Precipitation dataset; 0.5 degree latitude x 0.5 degree longitude global grid) to calculate global mean annual ranges in SST for marine environments and surface air temperature ranges for freshwater and terrestrial environments. Surface air temperature has been shown to correlate linearly with water temperature, particularly on a monthly time scale, and thus is a reasonably good indicator of temperature variation in freshwater systems [49]. In cases where the estimated ATR was less than that of the range derived from the original study, we used the latter given that it represents a direct measurement. Sampling locations are presented in Figure 1.

179

180 Statistical analyses were conducted in R [50]. We compared several candidate models to  
181 best predict seasonal T-S gradients based on the Akaike's information criterion (AIC). Using  
182 seasonal T-S gradient as the dependent variable, developmental environment (aquatic-  
183 developing vs. terrestrial-developing), log10-transformed species body mass (at 15°C  
184 calculated using species-specific T-S slopes) and mean annual temperature were  
185 incorporated as fixed variables in a global linear mixed effects model (using package lme4).  
186 Log10-transformed species body mass was included to determine if the seasonal T-S  
187 gradient was mass dependent, (i.e. to determine if larger species adjusted their body size  
188 more strongly with intra-annual warming), following the results of Forster *et al.*, 2012 [12]  
189 and Horne *et al.*, 2015 [13]. Given the strong association between latitude and mean annual  
190 temperature, we modelled the effect of latitude on the seasonal T-S gradient separately.  
191 Gradients from multiple studies of the same species were included in our analyses. Species  
192 have shared evolutionary histories and are not completely statistically independent; we  
193 therefore included levels of taxonomic classification (subphylum, class, order, family, and  
194 species) as nested (hierarchical) random effects on the intercept in all models to help control  
195 for phylogeny [51]. We also included habitat (marine, freshwater, terrestrial) as a random  
196 effect on the intercept, to control for the fact that we had aquatic-developing species from  
197 both marine and freshwater habitats. Including sex as a random effect did not improve the fit  
198 of the model, and so this was excluded. Finally, as the dependent variable in our models (the  
199 seasonal T-S gradient) is derived from data that vary between studies and species in their  
200 goodness of fit (see Supplementary Information for individual plots of ln-transformed body  
201 mass vs. temperature), we accounted for variation in information quality by weighting each  
202 seasonal T-S gradient by the inverse of the variance of its T-S slope estimate (using the  
203 'weights' function in R) [52]. All possible combinations of the global model terms were  
204 compared using the dredge function in the MuMIn package. The best model was identified  
205 as that with the lowest small-samples corrected AIC (AICc). Where the difference between a

model's AICc and the lowest AICc (i.e.  $\Delta AICc$ ) was  $<2$ , a set of best fit models, rather than a single best model, was assumed. Model averaging was then used to identify the best predictor variables across the top candidate models, and determine their relative importance (computed for each variable as the sum of the Akaike weights from all models in which they appear). In addition to AIC, a series of  $F$  tests were used to verify the significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) of each parameter's effect on the strength of the seasonal T-S gradient. *Post hoc* comparisons were made using a Tukey HSD test.

To estimate the total change in body mass that a species could achieve over a season, we multiplied the seasonal T-S slope by the ATR of the sampling location for each species. This value was transformed into total percentage change in body size using the formula  $(\exp^{(\text{slope} \times \text{ATR})} - 1) \times 100 = \text{total \% change in mass}$ . We compared total percentage change in body size between aquatic-developing and terrestrial species using a two-sample  $t$ -test. For both groups, an OLS regression of total % change in mass against ATR was used to determine whether species from more or less thermally variable environments exhibited a greater total percentage change in body size over a season. Given that the slope of this regression did not differ significantly from zero, and thus total percentage change in body size appeared relatively invariant with ATR, we also estimated the maximum total percentage change in body size with warming for aquatic-developing and terrestrial species. To do this, we used package `quantreg` in R to fit the lowest possible quantile regression that complied with the sample size of each data set, following recommendations by Rogers (1992) [53], such that  $n > 5/q$  (where  $n$  is the sample size and  $q$  is the quantile of interest). This gives the most reliable estimate of the edge of the data set appropriate to the sample size. Each quantile regression had a slope that did not differ significantly from zero; thus, we simply used the intercept to estimate the limit to total percentage change in body size over the season. Similarly, we also estimated the minimum total percentage change in body size with warming

by fitting the highest possible quantile regression through the data that complied with the sample size of each data set, where  $n > 5(1 - q)$  [53].

To compare seasonal T-S gradients with laboratory controlled T-S responses and L-S clines, we used the data compilations of Horne *et al.* (2015) [13]. Where possible, we added data from our own search to these two body size data sets, using identical methods to screen and quantify size changes. For each of these data sets, we first combined size gradients from multiple studies of the same species into a simple mean to generate single species-specific values. Order-specific gradients were then calculated by averaging species-specific gradients for each taxonomic order, and reduced major axis (RMA) regression analysis was used to compare order-specific seasonal T-S gradients with laboratory T-S responses and L-S clines.

We note that using interspecific length-mass conversions can increase the likelihood of inaccuracy when determining body size gradients, particularly as any small deviation in the equation's power term can result in substantial over- or under-estimation of the percentage change in body size. Given that we sometimes had to use family- and order-specific conversions, and that authors have employed a variety of equation forms, we repeated our analysis using length in place of dry mass to generate a second set of seasonal temperature-length (T-L) gradients (% change in length °C<sup>-1</sup>). To do this we used either the original length measurements reported, or calculated the cube-root of mass when this was given. This length-based analysis confirms the difference in responses between environment types (aquatic, terrestrial), and the major findings from this approach are summarised in the Supplementary Information.

## RESULTS

Our analysis included data from 71 sites in both temperate and tropical habitats between -38.1° and 61.5° latitude, although 52% of all study locations are found either in Europe or North America and hence dominated by northern hemisphere temperate areas (Figure 1). We obtained 3,725 seasonal body mass measurements in nature, representing 30 freshwater, 47 marine and 25 terrestrial arthropod species from 9 taxonomic orders, resulting in 225 seasonal T-S slopes (see Supplementary Information for species list and individual plots of ln-transformed body mass vs. temperature). Most species (~86%) conformed to the temperature-size rule; that is 88 of the 102 species exhibited a seasonal decrease in adult body size with increased temperature in the field.

### Aquatic vs. Terrestrial Species

The best supported model for explaining variation in seasonal T-S gradients contained only developmental environment (aquatic vs. terrestrial) as a fixed variable. Three other models, including an 'intercept only' model, had a  $\Delta AICc < 2$ . Therefore, we calculated combined parameter Akaike weights across all four candidate models to determine the relative importance of each variable (Table S2 in Supplementary Information). Developmental environment was the most important variable, accounting for ~30% of the total variance in the seasonal T-S gradient. Aquatic-developing species showed a ~2½-fold stronger reduction in body size with seasonal warming (-3.1% body mass °C<sup>-1</sup> ±0.8; 95% CI) than terrestrial species (-1.4% body mass °C<sup>-1</sup> ±0.9; 95% CI;  $F_{1,211}=16.90$ ,  $p<0.001$ ; see Figure 2). Similarly, within the order Diptera, which contains species that develop in water and on land, aquatic-developing species reduced their body size significantly more per °C of seasonal warming than did terrestrial-developing species ( $F_{1,34}=10.17$ ,  $p<0.01$ ). These differences between aquatic and terrestrial environments were also important in influencing both laboratory T-S responses and L-S clines in the field [13] (Figure 2).

283

284  $\bar{T}$  had no significant effect on the seasonal T-S gradient in either aquatic-developing  
 285 ( $F_{1,172}=0.42$ ,  $p=0.32$ ) or terrestrial arthropods ( $F_{1,35}=2.80$ ,  $p=0.10$ ). The seasonal T-S gradient  
 286 across aquatic-developing species became more strongly negative with increasing body  
 287 mass ( $F_{1,172}=6.60$ ,  $p=0.01$ ), but the goodness of fit was extremely low ( $R^2=0.02$ ). Thus body  
 288 mass explained relatively little of the variation in aquatic seasonal T-S gradients in our  
 289 dataset. There was no significant mass-dependence in terrestrial species ( $F_{1,35}=0.06$ ,  
 290  $p=0.80$ ). There were significant differences in the strength of the seasonal T-S gradient  
 291 between taxonomic orders within the sub-class Copepoda; the order Calanoida (-  
 292  $3.66\pm0.70\%$  body mass  $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ; 95%CI) had a significantly stronger negative seasonal T-S  
 293 gradient than both Cyclopoida ( $-0.91\pm0.59\%$  body mass  $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ; 95%CI) and Poecilostomatoida  
 294 ( $1.36\pm3.06\%$  body mass  $^{\circ}\text{C}^{-1}$ ; 95%CI). Latitude of the sampling location had no significant  
 295 effect on the strength of the seasonal T-S gradient ( $F_{1,122}=1.13$ ,  $p=0.29$ ).

296

297 Total percentage change in body size over the annual cycle differed significantly between  
 298 aquatic-developing and terrestrial species ( $t_{223}=-3.52$ ,  $p<0.001$ ), but did not vary with mean  
 299 annual temperature range in either group, such that, on average, total size change appeared  
 300 relatively constant ( $t_{180}=0.37$ ,  $p=0.71$  and  $t_{41}=0.47$ ,  $p=0.64$  respectively; see Figure 3). Mean  
 301 overall size reduction in terrestrial species was  $-10.7\pm4.8\%$  (95% CI), whereas overall size  
 302 reduction in aquatic-developing species was almost 3-fold greater at  $-31.3\pm5.5\%$  (95% CI)  
 303 (Figure 3c). Additionally, based on the lowest and highest possible quantile regressions  
 304 through these data (see Methods), we estimated a limit for total percentage change in body  
 305 mass in aquatic-developing species of  $-80.2\pm22.6\%$  (95% CI), which is more than 2½-fold  
 306 greater than in terrestrial-developing species at  $-29.7\pm24.9\%$  (95% CI). The lower limit to  
 307 total percentage change in size with warming did not differ significantly from 0% in either  
 308 aquatic ( $t_{180}=0.17$ ,  $p=0.87$ ) or terrestrial species ( $t_{41}=0.55$ ,  $p=0.58$ ).

### Coherence among seasonal, laboratory and latitudinal body size patterns

If temperature is a major driver of seasonal body size variation in the field, seasonal and controlled laboratory T-S responses should be significantly correlated. Indeed, across taxonomic orders these two gradients showed a positive correlation, which did not differ significantly from a 1:1 relationship ( $R^2=0.59$ ; Figure 4a). This 1:1 match was supported by the RMA slope differing significantly from zero but not from 1 ( $0.73\pm0.38$ ; 95% CI), whilst the intercept did not differ significantly from zero ( $-0.39\pm1.16$ ; 95%CI) (inferred from 95% confidence intervals; see inset panel in Figure 4a). Given the relatively strong T-S gradients (seasonal and laboratory) of aquatic Isopoda compared with those of the other taxonomic orders, we also tested whether the RMA regression, and hence co-variation between seasonal and laboratory T-S gradients, was dependent on this taxonomic order. The RMA regression did not differ significantly from a 1:1 relationship when the aquatic Isopoda were excluded (slope= $1.31\pm0.90$ ; intercept= $0.56\pm1.85$ ;  $R^2=0.41$ ). The seasonal and laboratory datasets largely contained different species, yet, even for the small number of species for which we had both sets of data ( $n=22$ ), there was positive correlation between the two. Once again the RMA slope differed significantly from zero but not 1 ( $1.51\pm0.61$ ; 95%CI), whereas the intercept did not differ significantly from zero ( $1.80\pm2.28$ ; 95%CI).

Seasonal T-S gradients negatively correlated with L-S clines at the level of taxonomic order ( $R^2=0.81$ ; Figure 4b): those orders (e.g. Isopoda) whose members grew to a smaller adult size in warmer seasons also showed a decrease in size towards lower, warmer latitudes. Although we would not expect a 1:1 relationship between these size gradients ( $1^\circ$  increase in latitude does not equal  $1^\circ\text{C}$  change in temperature), the gradient of the RMA slope did differ significantly from zero ( $-0.57\pm0.28$ ; 95% CI), confirming a significant correlation, whilst the intercept did not differ significantly from zero ( $-0.79\pm0.93$ ; 95% CI; see inset panel in

Figure 4b). As before, there remained a significant correlation even when the aquatic Isopoda were excluded (slope= $-0.58 \pm 0.52$ ; intercept= $-0.78 \pm 1.14$ ;  $R^2=0.59$ ).

## DISCUSSION

Our analysis of seasonal T-S gradients leads us to present four major conclusions: (i) multivoltine arthropod species inhabiting thermally varying seasonal habitats commonly demonstrate a negative seasonal T-S gradient, (ii) aquatic-developing species exhibit a stronger decline in adult body size with seasonal warming than those developing in air, (iii) total size reduction with warming appears relatively invariant despite variation in the annual temperature range experienced, and (iv) seasonal T-S gradients correlate significantly with both laboratory T-S responses and latitudinal-size clines.

The aquatic-terrestrial differences in seasonal T-S gradients per °C parallel those observed in laboratory T-S responses and latitudinal-size clines [12, 13] (Figure 2). Further, mean overall size reduction through the year is almost 3-fold greater in aquatic (31.3%) than terrestrial (10.7%) arthropods (Figure 3c). The greatest overall reduction in body mass with temperature for an aquatic species in our dataset is 90.4%, estimated for the calanoid copepod *Temora longicornis*, whereas in terrestrial species it is 56.4%, estimated for the isopod *Porcellionides pruinosus*. These consistent differences in seasonal T-S gradients between environments suggest that the drivers of body size reduction with warming are much stronger in aquatic than terrestrial arthropods.

The difference in seasonal body size change between environments is consistent with the hypothesis that greater constraints on oxygen availability in water than in air have either selected for greater plasticity in adult body size of aquatic species in response to



360 temperature (both per °C and overall), or imposed constraints directly on their growth,  
361 compared with terrestrial species [29]. Specifically, metabolic demand increases much faster  
362 with increased size and temperature than does oxygen availability in water [12];  
363 consequently, aquatic-developing species may have adapted to meet these increased  
364 metabolic demands with warming by reducing body size, and/or oxygen limitation may also  
365 have limited growth directly. An alternative explanation based on thermoregulatory ability  
366 also requires consideration. In the field, behavioural thermoregulation may allow arthropod  
367 species to maintain a narrower body temperature range over a season relative to the  
368 ambient temperature range, be this through seeking shade or basking in terrestrial species,  
369 or vertical / horizontal migration in aquatic species. For this reason, the seasonal T-S  
370 gradient in thermoregulating species may seem weaker. Due to the higher heat capacity of  
371 water than air, thermoregulation is much more difficult for aquatic than terrestrial species.  
372 However, we discount the explanation that thermoregulation may explain the differences  
373 seen between environments, because this ability is unlikely to account for a 2½-fold  
374 difference in body size reduction with warming between these two groups – such an  
375 explanation would imply that, where aquatic species experience an annual temperature  
376 range of 30°C, terrestrial species experience a range in body temperature of only 12°C, i.e.  
377 are able to reduce their body temperature range by 18°C. At least in some environments,  
378 this major reduction in body temperature range is highly improbable [54]. Furthermore, larger  
379 aquatic species often exhibit the greatest reduction in body size with warming [12, 13], yet  
380 we see no reason why behavioural thermoregulation would be reduced in larger compared  
381 to smaller aquatic species. Instead, this pattern supports the prediction that due to their  
382 lower surface area to volume ratio, larger species would struggle most to meet their oxygen  
383 requirements in the warm, leading to a stronger T-S gradient. Therefore, behavioural  
384 buffering does not seem capable of explaining the observed mass-dependence of the T-S  
385 gradient in aquatic species, which instead is consistent with the oxygen hypothesis [12].

386

Although body size reduction with warming is thought to provide fitness benefits by balancing resource demand and supply at elevated temperatures, this likely comes at a cost, given the link between body size and other vital rates and physiological processes. For example, body size is often strongly positively correlated with fecundity, including in insects [55] and zooplankton [56], whilst smaller body size may also reduce survival during periods of low food availability, or increase vulnerability to predation [18]. Thus, there will eventually come a point at which the fitness benefits of reducing body size no longer outweigh the costs. These widespread fitness trade-offs may dictate overall limits to total proportional size change in arthropods; an optimal point at which the selective pressures in a given environment over the annual cycle no longer favour more extreme size reductions with warming. The relative consistency in total proportional size change in relation to ATR, despite variation in ATR of up to 30°C between sampling locations, may be an indication of such limits (Figure 3). Although these optima vary between species and environments, as is observed in the ~3-fold difference in mean total body size reduction between aquatic and terrestrial species, and in the scatter in total proportional change, the lack of a relationship with ATR suggests that, on average, arthropods from similar environments may share and frequently realize these limits, regardless of the degree of thermal variability across the year. Consequently, species inhabiting environments with a greater thermal range on average reduce their body size less per °C of warming than those from less thermally varying environments.

Unexplained variation in the magnitude of T-S gradients between species and higher taxonomic groupings is likely to be attributed to differences in life history, physiology and behaviour. Indeed, such effects have been explored in the sub-class Copepoda, in which the ~4-fold difference between the seasonal T-S gradients of calanoid and cyclopoid copepods may relate to differences in the temperature-dependence of energy supply and expenditure in current-feeding calanoids vs. ambush-feeding cyclopoids [35]. Differences in the strength

of seasonal variation in resource availability (e.g., food and water in terrestrial species, and food and oxygen in aquatic species) or seasonal mortality risk (e.g. associated with predation, desiccation or both) are also likely to modify the T-S gradient. Although the arthropods in our data set all have more than one generation per year, some groups, such as some of the Lepidoptera species included here, have just two generations in a year, whereas others, including the smaller terrestrial Diptera and aquatic Copepoda, have many overlapping generations. Voltinism is highly temperature-dependent and can constrain body size [19, 27], and differences in perceived seasonality (including temperature and resource availability) between species with these different generation times, might lead to differences in the strength of the seasonal T-S gradient. Specifically, smaller species with short generation times are likely to perceive reduced seasonality within each generation [27]. Hence, we might predict that the adaptive advantage of tuning body size to prevailing conditions during development will be strong, leading to a greater reduction in body size and a greater seasonal T-S gradient. Our data largely applies to species with many overlapping generations in a year, making it difficult to assign body size measurements to specific generations or cohorts. A synthesis of changes in mature body size in univoltine terrestrial species, measured over multiple years, would be an informative next step, not least because these species often exhibit a reverse T-S response in the laboratory (i.e. increase in size with warming) and an increase in size towards the equator. In accordance with these patterns, a recent study of a univoltine butterfly species showed that adult male forewing length was positively correlated with temperature during development across multiple years [57]. Whether such an inter-annual size trend extends more generally to other univoltine terrestrial arthropods remains to be tested.

We note the potential for a mismatch between temperature at the time of collection of adults in the field and the temperature the animals experienced during ontogenetic development. This is particularly true for larger species with longer development times and/or in those

species from strongly seasonal environments. However, as discussed above, many of the multivoltine species considered here generally have short generation times, often of just a few weeks; thus, in most cases any temperature fluctuations experienced within a generation should be fairly conserved, and temperature at time of collection of adults should be a reasonable proxy for developmental temperature. Similar issues could arise in species that either undergo extended periods of reproductive diapause, or live a long time as adults, particularly the larger Lepidoptera species in our data set (6 of 10 Lepidopteran species considered), during which time juvenile recruitment to the population is ceased. In this case, adults collected during periods of diapause, or towards the end of long adult lives, may actually develop much earlier in the season, when environmental conditions were very different. This is further complicated because larger individuals generally have a greater chance of surviving periods of dormancy, and this could be an important factor influencing body size variation in diapausing generations, obscuring any effects of temperature and/or resource availability [58]. Yet, when we further explored this issue, by excluding body size measurements recorded during suspected periods of reproductive diapause, we observed no significant shift in the T-S slope in any of the 6 species of Lepidoptera that exhibited this behaviour. These species represent the few extreme cases in our data set where juvenile recruitment is ceased for relatively long periods, giving us confidence in the overall patterns we present.

Despite the potential pitfalls in our data and the many confounding factors that can influence body size variation in the field, we find a statistically significant match between body size responses measured in the laboratory and in nature, which suggests that they share common drivers. The consistency in both the strength and direction of all three of these body size gradients observed both at the levels of taxonomic order (Figure 4) and of species, as well as between environments, and together with the weighting of data by data quality, gives us confidence that these patterns are unlikely to arise simply from differences in sample size

between groups or potential sampling error in the individual T-S slopes. Ultimately, the close match between laboratory and seasonal T-S gradients (see Figures 2 and 4a) suggests that temperature is an important driver of variation in mature body size in arthropods in the diverse seasonal systems we have explored, despite changes in other abiotic and biotic factors that can directly influence body size variation, such as food quantity and quality [59].

Here we use a simple yet powerful correlative approach to understand major patterns in body size. Although our data set represents only a tiny fraction of all arthropod species globally, we identify important patterns in body size that co-vary with major body size gradients. Evidently, changes in the body sizes of ectotherms associated with climate change can be both substantial [41-43] and widespread [16]. Advancing our understanding of what drives temperature-body size gradients in the field is essential if we are to accurately predict how body size will change with projected increases in temperature and with more extreme seasonality [40].

# **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

We thank Mridul Thomas and Colin Kremer for their help in processing the SST data, Raymond Huey for his insightful comments on our work, and Dirk Zeuss and Tiit Teder, whose feedback helped to greatly improve the paper. CH is supported by a Natural Environment Research Council (NERC) Studentship NE/L501797/1. AGH was supported by NERC and the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs [grant number NE/L003279/1, Marine Ecosystems Research Programme]. The Centre for Ocean Life is a VKR Centre of Excellence supported by the Villum Foundation.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Hirst, A.G., Glazier, D.S. & Atkinson, D. 2014 Body shape shifting during growth permits tests that distinguish between competing geometric theories of metabolic scaling. *Ecol. Lett.* **17**, 1274-1281. (doi:10.1111/ele.12334).
- [2] Peters, R.H. 1983 *The ecological implications of body size*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [3] Kleiber, M. 1947 Body size and metabolic rate. *Physiol. Rev.* **27**, 511-541.
- [4] Brown, J.H., Gillooly, J.F., Allen, A.P., Savage, V.M. & West, G.B. 2004 Toward a metabolic theory of ecology. *Ecology* **85**, 1771-1789. (doi:10.1890/03-9000).
- [5] Darwin, C. 1859 On the origins of species by means of natural selection. *London: Murray*.
- [6] Schmidt-Nielsen, K. 1984 *Scaling: why is animal size so important?* Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- [7] Walters, R.J. & Hassall, M. 2006 The temperature-size rule in ectotherms: May a general explanation exist after all? *The American Naturalist* **167**, 510-523.
- [8] Karl, I. & Fischer, K. 2008 Why get big in the cold? Towards a solution to a life-history puzzle. *Oecologia* **155**, 215-225. (doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0902-0).
- [9] Bergmann, C. 1847 Über die verhältnisse der wärmeökonomie der thiere zu ihrer grösse. *Göttinger Studien, Göttingen* **3**, 595-708.
- [10] Shelomi, M. 2012 Where are we now? Bergmann's rule sensu lato in insects. *Am. Nat.* **180**, 511-519.
- [11] Atkinson, D. 1994 Temperature and organism size - A biological law for ectotherms. *Adv. Ecol. Res.* **25**, 1-58. (doi:10.1016/S0065-2504(08)60212-3).
- [12] Forster, J., Hirst, A.G. & Atkinson, D. 2012 Warming-induced reductions in body size are greater in aquatic than terrestrial species. *PNAS* **109**, 19310-19314. (doi:10.1073/pnas.1210460109).

- 518 [13] Horne, C.R., Hirst, A.G. & Atkinson, D. 2015 Temperature-size responses match  
 519 latitudinal-size clines in arthropods, revealing critical differences between aquatic and  
 520 terrestrial species. *Ecol. Lett.* **18**, 327-335. (doi:10.1111/ele.12413).
- 521 [14] Stillwell, R.C., Wallin, W.G., Hitchcock, L.J. & Fox, C.W. 2007 Phenotypic plasticity in a  
 522 complex world: interactive effects of food and temperature on fitness components of a seed  
 523 beetle. *Oecologia* **153**, 309-321. (doi:10.1007/s00442-007-0748-5).
- 524 [15] James, F.C. 1970 Geographic size variation in birds and its relationship to climate.  
 525 *Ecology* **51**, 365-390. (doi:10.2307/1935374).
- 526 [16] Gardner, J.L., Peters, A., Kearney, M.R., Joseph, L. & Heinsohn, R. 2011 Declining  
 527 body size: a third universal response to warming? *Trends Ecol. Evol.* **26**, 285-291.  
 528 (doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.03.005).
- 529 [17] Stillwell, R.C. 2010 Are latitudinal clines in body size adaptive? *Oikos* **119**, 1387-1390.  
 530 (doi:10.1111/j.1600-0706.2010.18670.x).
- 531 [18] Chown, S.L. & Gaston, K.J. 2010 Body size variation in insects: a macroecological  
 532 perspective. *Biol. Rev. Camb. Philos. Soc.* **85**, 139-169. (doi:10.1111/j.1469-  
 533 185X.2009.00097.x).
- 534 [19] Roff, D. 1980 Optimizing development time in a seasonal environment: the 'ups and  
 535 downs' of clinal variation. *Oecologia* **45**, 202-208.
- 536 [20] Mousseau, T.A. 1997 Ectotherms Follow the Converse to Bergmann's Rule. *Evolution*  
 537 **51**, 630-632. (doi:10.2307/2411138).
- 538 [21] Zeuss, D., Brunzel, S. & Brandl, R. 2016 Environmental drivers of voltinism and body  
 539 size in insect assemblages across Europe. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **26**, 154-165.  
 540 (doi:10.1111/geb.12525).
- 541 [22] Kivelä, S.M., Välimäki, P., Carrasco, D., Mäenpää, M.I. & Oksanen, J. 2011 Latitudinal  
 542 insect body size clines revisited: a critical evaluation of the saw-tooth model. *J. Anim. Ecol.*  
 543 **80**, 1184-1195. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-2656.2011.01864.x).
- 544 [23] Merilä, J. & Hendry, A.P. 2014 Climate change, adaptation, and phenotypic plasticity:  
 545 the problem and the evidence. *Evol. Appl.* **7**, 1-14. (doi:10.1111/eva.12137).

- 546 [24] Davidowitz, G., Nijhout, H.F. & Roff, D.A. 2012 Predicting the response to simultaneous  
547 selection: genetic architecture and physiological constraints. *Evolution* **66**, 2916-2928.  
548 (doi:10.1111/j.1558-5646.2012.01644.x).
- 549 [25] Angilletta, M.J., Steury, T.D. & Sears, M.W. 2004 Temperature, growth rate, and body  
550 size in ectotherms: Fitting pieces of a life history puzzle. *ICB* **44**, 498-509.  
551 (doi:10.1093/icb/44.6.498).
- 552 [26] Kingsolver, J.G. & Huey, R.B. 2008 Size, temperature, and fitness: three rules. *Evol.*  
553 *Ecol. Res.* **10**, 251-268.
- 554 [27] Kozłowski, J., Czarnoleski, M. & Danko, M. 2004 Can optimal resource allocation  
555 models explain why ectotherms grow larger in cold? *ICB* **44**, 480-493.
- 556 [28] Verberk, W.C.E.P., Bilton, D.T., Calosi, P. & Spicer, J.I. 2011 Oxygen supply in aquatic  
557 ectotherms: Partial pressure and solubility together explain biodiversity and size patterns.  
558 *Ecology* **92**, 1565-1572. (doi:10.1890/10-2369.1).
- 559 [29] Atkinson, D., Morley, S.A. & Hughes, R.N. 2006 From cells to colonies: at what levels of  
560 body organization does the 'temperature-size rule' apply? *Evol. Dev.* **8**, 202-214.  
561 (doi:10.1111/j.1525-142X.2006.00090.x).
- 562 [30] Gibson, R.N. & Atkinson, R.J.A. 2003 Oxygen minimum zone benthos: adaptation and  
563 community response to hypoxia. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review* **41**,  
564 1-45.
- 565 [31] Hoefnagel, N.K. & Verberk, W.C.E.P. 2014 Is the temperature-size rule mediated by  
566 oxygen in aquatic ectotherms? *J. Therm. Biol.* **54**, 56-65.  
567 (doi:10.1016/j.jtherbio.2014.12.003).
- 568 [32] Chrzanowski, T.H., Crotty, R.D. & Hubbard, G.J. 1988 Seasonal variation in cell volume  
569 of epilimnetic bacteria. *Microb. Ecol.* **16**, 155-163. (doi:10.2307/4251012).
- 570 [33] Diéguez, M., Modenutti, B. & Queimaliños, C. 1998 Influence of abiotic and biotic factors  
571 on morphological variation of *Keratella cochlearis* (Gosse) in a small Andean lake.  
572 *Hydrobiologia* **387**, 289-294. (doi:10.1023/A:1017003029568).



- 573 [34] Hirst, A.G., Sheader, M. & Williams, J.A. 1999 Annual pattern of calanoid copepod  
574 abundance, prosome length and minor role in pelagic carbon flux in the Solent, UK. *Mar.*  
575 *Ecol. Prog. Ser.* **177**, 133-146. (doi:10.3354/meps177133).
- 576 [35] Horne, C.R., Hirst, A.G., Atkinson, D., Neves, A. & Kiørboe, T. 2016 A global synthesis  
577 of seasonal temperature-size responses in copepods. *Glob. Ecol. Biogeogr.* **25**, 988-999.  
578 (doi:10.1111/geb.12460).
- 579 [36] Miyashita, L.K., Gaeta, S.A. & Lopes, R.M. 2011 Life cycle and reproductive traits of  
580 marine podonids (Cladocera, Onychopoda) in a coastal subtropical area. *J. Plankton Res.*  
581 **33**, 779-792. (doi:10.1093/plankt/fbq147).
- 582 [37] Kari, J.S. & Huey, R.B. 2000 Size and seasonal temperature in free-ranging *Drosophila*  
583 *subobscura*. *J. Therm. Biol.* **25**, 267-272. (doi:10.1016/s0306-4565(99)00096-0).
- 584 [38] Blanck, A. & Lamouroux, N. 2007 Large-scale intraspecific variation in life-history traits  
585 of European freshwater fish. *J. Biogeogr.* **34**, 862-875. (doi:10.1111/j.1365-  
586 2699.2006.01654.x).
- 587 [39] Ashton, K.G., Feldman, C.R. & Garland Jr, T. 2003 Bergmann's rule in nonavian  
588 reptiles: turtles follow it, lizards and snakes reverse it. *Evolution* **57**, 1151-1163.  
589 (doi:10.1554/0014-3820(2003)057[1151:brinrt]2.0.co;2).
- 590 [40] IPCC. 2014 *Climate change 2013 – The physical science basis*. Cambridge, Cambridge  
591 University Press.
- 592 [41] Daufresne, M., Lengfellner, K. & Sommer, U. 2009 Global warming benefits the small in  
593 aquatic ecosystems. *PNAS* **106**, 12788-12793. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0902080106).
- 594 [42] Sheridan, J.A. & Bickford, D. 2011 Shrinking body size as an ecological response to  
595 climate change. *Nature Clim. Change* **1**, 401-406. (doi:10.1038/nclimate1259).
- 596 [43] Rice, E., Dam, H. & Stewart, G. 2015 Impact of climate change on estuarine  
597 zooplankton: surface water warming in Long Island Sound is associated with changes in  
598 copepod size and community structure. *Estuaries and Coasts* **38**, 13-23.  
599 (doi:10.1007/s12237-014-9770-0).

- 600 [44] May, R.M. 1988 How many species are there on earth? *Science* **241**, 1441-1449.  
601 (doi:10.1126/science.241.4872.1441).
- 602 [45] Klein, A.M., Vaissiere, B.E., Cane, J.H., Steffan-Dewenter, I., Cunningham, S.A.,  
603 Kremen, C. & Tscharntke, T. 2007 Importance of pollinators in changing landscapes for  
604 world crops. *Proc. R. Soc. Biol. Sci. Ser. B* **274**, 303-313. (doi:10.1098/rspb.2006.3721).
- 605 [46] Hill, D.S. 1997 *The economic importance of insects*. London, Chapman & Hall.
- 606 [47] WoRMS Editorial Board. 2016 World Register of Marine Species. Available from  
607 <http://www.marinespecies.org> at VLIZ. Accessed 2015-2010-2022.
- 608 [48] Hirst, A.G., Horne, C.R. & Atkinson, D. 2015 Equal temperature-size responses of the  
609 sexes are widespread in arthropod species. *Proc. R. Soc. Biol. Sci. Ser. B* **282**, 20152475.  
610 (doi:10.1098/rspb.2015.2475).
- 611 [49] Pilgrim, J.M., Fang, X. & Stefan, H.G. 1998 Stream temperature correlations with air  
612 temperatures in Minnesota: implications for climate warming. *JAWRA Journal of the*  
613 *American Water Resources Association* **34**, 1109-1121. (doi:10.1111/j.1752-  
614 1688.1998.tb04158.x).
- 615 [50] R Core Team. 2014 *R: A language and environment for statistical computing*. Vienna,  
616 Austria, R Foundation for Statistical Computing.
- 617 [51] Felsenstein, J. 1985 Phylogenies and the Comparative Method. *The American naturalist*  
618 **125**, 1-15.
- 619 [52] Koricheva, J., Gurevitch, J. & Mengersen, K., eds. 2013 *Handbook of meta-analysis in*  
620 *ecology and evolution*, Princeton University Press.
- 621 [53] Rogers, W. 1992 Quantile regression standard errors. *Stata Technical Bulletin* **2**, 16-19.
- 622 [54] Kearney, M., Shine, R. & Porter, W.P. 2009 The potential for behavioral  
623 thermoregulation to buffer "cold-blooded" animals against climate warming. *PNAS* **106**,  
624 3835-3840. (doi:10.1073/pnas.0808913106).
- 625 [55] Honěk, A. 1993 Intraspecific variation in body size and fecundity in insects: A general  
626 relationship. *Oikos* **66**, 483-492. (doi:10.2307/3544943).

[56] Bunker, A.J. & Hirst, A.G. 2004 Fecundity of marine planktonic copepods: global rates and patterns in relation to chlorophyll a, temperature and body weight. *Marine Ecology-Progress Series* **279**, 161-181. (doi:10.3354/meps279161).

[57] Fenberg, P.B., Self, A., Stewart, J.R., Wilson, R.J. & Brooks, S.J. 2016 Exploring the universal ecological responses to climate change in a univoltine butterfly. *J. Anim. Ecol.* (doi:10.1111/1365-2656.12492).

[58] Teder, T., Esperk, T., Remmel, T., Sang, A. & Tammaru, T. 2010 Counterintuitive size patterns in bivoltine moths: late-season larvae grow larger despite lower food quality. *Oecologia* **162**, 117-125. (doi:10.1007/s00442-009-1439-1).

[59] Diamond, S.E. & Kingsolver, J.G. 2010 Environmental dependence of thermal reaction norms: host plant quality can reverse the temperature size rule. *Am. Nat.* **175**, 1-10. (doi:10.1086/648602).

## FIGURE LEGENDS

**Figure 1.** World map (equirectangular projection) indicating the location of studies (n=71) from which seasonal temperature-size gradients were recorded, categorized by environment type. Colour gradient indicates mean annual temperature ranges. Sea surface temperature data was used for marine environments. Air surface temperature data was used for terrestrial and freshwater environments. Data sources are given in the Methods.


**Figure 2.** Comparison of mean aquatic-developing and terrestrial-developing seasonal temperature-body size gradients (% change in mass per °C  $\pm$ 95% CI, left-hand y-axis) in arthropods with laboratory temperature-size responses (% change in mass per °C  $\pm$ 95% CI, left-hand y-axis) and latitudinal-size clines (% change in mass per °latitude  $\pm$ 95% CI, right-hand y-axis) for multivoltine species, using data from this study and Horne *et al.*, 2015 [13]. Different letters above data points indicate significant differences. Dashed grey line indicates no change in body size with warming or increasing latitude. Note the reversal of the right-hand y-axis (for the latitudinal-size cline) for ease of comparison (a reduction in body size with increasing temperature is then comparable with an increase in body size with increasing latitude).

**Figure 3.** Total change in body mass (%) vs. annual temperature range (°C) for (a) terrestrial and (b) aquatic arthropods. Solid black line represents the OLS regression, the slope of which does not differ significantly from zero in either environment, such that total percentage change in mass appears invariant with annual temperature range. Dashed black lines show the lowest and highest possible quantile regressions through the data and represent the upper and lower limits to total body size reduction with warming respectively (c) Mean total size reduction with warming (expressed as a % change in body mass ( $\pm$ 95% CI)) for

676 terrestrial and aquatic-developing species. Different letters above data points indicate  
677 significant differences.

678


679 **Figure 4.** Reduced major axis (RMA) regression comparing seasonal temperature-size  
680 gradients (% change in body mass per °C  $\pm$ SE) in arthropods with (a) laboratory  
681 temperature-size responses (% change in body mass per °C  $\pm$ SE), and (b) latitudinal-size  
682 clines (% change in body mass per °lat  $\pm$ SE), categorized by taxonomic order and  
683 developmental environment (aquatic=open symbols; terrestrial=filled symbols). Dashed lines  
684 indicate a 1:1 relationship. Inset graphs show the intercept and slope values for each  
685 regression ( $\pm$ 95% CI).



**Figure 1.** World map (equirectangular projection) indicating the location of studies ( $n=71$ ) from which seasonal temperature-size gradients were recorded, categorized by environment type. Colour gradient indicates mean annual temperature ranges. Sea surface temperature data was used for marine environments. Air surface temperature data was used for terrestrial and freshwater environments. Data sources are given in the Methods.


Figure 1

393x171mm (96 x 96 DPI)



**Figure 2.** Comparison of mean aquatic-developing and terrestrial-developing seasonal temperature-body size gradients (% change in mass per  $^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 95\%$  CI, left-hand y-axis) in arthropods with laboratory temperature-size responses (% change in mass per  $^{\circ}\text{C} \pm 95\%$  CI, left-hand y-axis) and latitudinal-size clines (% change in mass per  $^{\circ}\text{latitude} \pm 95\%$  CI, right-hand y-axis) for multivoltine species, using data from this study and Horne *et al.* 2015 [13]. Different letters above data points indicate significant differences. Dashed grey line indicates no change in body size with warming or increasing latitude. Note the reversal of the right-hand y-axis (for the latitudinal-size cline) for ease of comparison (a reduction in body size with increasing temperature is then comparable with an increase in body size with increasing latitude).

Figure 2  
153x98mm (300 x 300 DPI)




**Figure 3.** Total change in body mass (%) vs. annual temperature range (°C) for (a) terrestrial and (b) aquatic arthropods. Solid black line represents the OLS regression, the slope of which does not differ significantly from zero in either environment, such that total percentage change in mass appears invariant with annual temperature range. Dashed black lines show the lowest and highest possible quantile regressions through the data and represent the upper and lower limits to total body size reduction with warming respectively (c) Mean total size reduction with warming (expressed as a % change in body mass ( $\pm 95\%$  CI)) for terrestrial and aquatic-developing species. Different letters above data points indicate significant differences.

Figure 3

259x255mm (300 x 300 DPI)





**Figure 4.** Reduced major axis (RMA) regression comparing seasonal temperature-size gradients (% change in body mass per °C ±SE) in arthropods with (a) laboratory temperature-size responses (% change in body mass per °C ±SE), and (b) latitudinal-size clines (% change in body mass per °lat ±SE), categorized by taxonomic order and developmental environment (aquatic=open symbols; terrestrial=filled symbols). Dashed lines indicate a 1:1 relationship. Inset graphs show the intercept and slope values for each regression (±95% CI).

Figure 4  
218x453mm (96 x 96 DPI)